

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended herein to remove the period in the middle of the claim.

The applicant does not understand what is not legible. One of the references is a US Patent no.5, 557,723. There are also three Japanese abstracts and an anonymous publication which were cited in the European search report. We sent you what we have. Surely the US patent is available to you. Please be more specific as to what you need. Is all of this unclear? We can send it to you again to be considered?

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Cook publication (2001/0025057). This reference was not published until February 5, 2004 and was not filed until July 8, 2003. Applicant filed a provisional application serial no. 60/276,177 on March 16, 2001 and a non-provisional application on January 18, 2002. This Cook reference filed July 8, 2003 and published February 5, 2004 is not therefore a valid reference. The publication references an application serial no. 09/595,416 filed June 15, 2000. Applicant does not know what was filed on June 15, 2000.

If this only reference is a valid reference it does not teach applicant's claimed invention for the following reasons.

The reference is for a different method and for a different purpose than that of applicant's application. The reference is for a message forwarding system to provide a secure E-mail service. The service is operable to receive an E-mail message temporarily in a storage and a check for recipient preferences for delivery. If a web based delivery is specified the system provides an E-mail notification to the recipient including a secure link to the recipient including extracting the message from storage, formatting the

message as a page and delivering the page to the recipient's browser. Applicant's system is for providing an improved E-mail system to prevent sending unfinished letters or messages going to the wrong parties. To accomplish this, the method contains the steps of requiring proofreading of the draft and acknowledgement of the proofreading and signing that the draft was proofread and approved before even permitting addressing of the message and further only after addressing the message, checking the address and signing the draft permitting sending of the E-mail.

Claim 1, as amended, calls for "generating a draft of the message, proofreading the draft of the message and acknowledging message is proofread and finished, signing the draft, only after signing the draft and acknowledging proofread and finished permitting addressing of the message, performing checking of the address and only after addressing the message and performing checking of the address and signing the draft permitting sending the E-mail."

It is not seen where the above is taught or even suggested in the recited paragraphs or anywhere in the reference. There is no proofing of the draft or acknowledgement the message is proofread or even that the message is finished. A message sent by the reference would suffer the same kind of problems the applicant's teaching overcomes. The signing in the reference is used for the encryption. As stated on page 3, right column, last paragraph 0047, the signing process 150 receives as an input a user signature phrase which is used to decrypt the user's private keys. There is no teaching of only permitting addressing after signing the draft and acknowledging the message is proofread and finished. Further there is no checking of addressing and signing

before sending the E-mail. Clearly, applicant claimed invention is not taught or even suggested by the Cook reference. Claim 1, as amended, is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 2-11 dependent on claim 1 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Claim 12 calls for “A method of generating an E-mail message comprising the steps of: drafting a text message by an author on a display screen; requiring an acknowledgment that the draft of the message is proofread and finished by the author; only after acknowledging the message is proofread and finished permitting addressing of the message, addressing the message; performing an automatic checking of the address after addressing the message; permitting sending of the E-mail only after receiving an acknowledgement of correct addressing.”

For reasons similar to that discussed above applicant’s Claim 12 is deemed allowable. The reference does not teach “requiring an acknowledgment that the draft of the message is proofread and finished by the author.” The reference does not teach “only after acknowledging the message is proofread and finished permitting addressing of the message.” The reference does not teach “performing an automatic checking of the address after addressing the message.” The reference does not teach “permitting sending of the E-mail only after receiving an acknowledgement of correct addressing.” Claim 12 is therefore deemed allowable over the references.

Claims 13-20 dependent on claim 12 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

In view of the above applicants Claims 1-20, as amended, are deemed allowable and an early notice of allowance of these claims is deemed in order and is respectfully requested.

Respectfully requested;



Robert L. Troike (Reg. 24183)

Telephone No. (301) 751-0825